



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

EC

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,680	09/23/2003	Lewis M. Nashner	469/132	1246
2101	7590	05/16/2005	EXAMINER	
BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP 125 SUMMER STREET BOSTON, MA 02110-1618			LAU, TUNG S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2863	

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/668,680

Applicant(s)

NASHNER, LEWIS M.

Examiner

Tung S. Lau

Art Unit

2863

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1, 2 and 5-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See office action.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 4-19-2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. Item BG is missing from the application file. Applicant is required to submit a legible copy of BG.

The IDS filed on 4-19-2005 and 4-28-2005 has been signed by the examiner.

Election/Restrictions

Combination/subcombination

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 3 and 4, drawn to screening task measurement, classified in class 702, subclass 185.
 - II. Claims 1, 2 and 5-24, drawn to screening human task measurement, classified in class 702, subclass 19.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Invention I and II are related as combination (invention I) and subcombination (invention II). Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particular of the subcombinations as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the

Art Unit: 2863

subcombination as claimed because Invention II, the combination as claimed does not required screening human task measurement. The subcombination (invention II) has separate utility such as a screening human task measurement. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Newly submitted amended claims 1, 2 and 5-24, directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the above reasons. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 1, 2 and 5-24 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kadlec et al. (U.S. Patent 6,347,018).

Regarding claim 3:

Kadlec discloses a system for detecting errors in balance related screening tests, the system comprising: a force-plate for measuring a quantity related to a stability factor of a balance task performed in trials by a subject under a plurality of distinct sensory conditions (Col. 4, Lines 10-40) ; and a computation device in communication with the force-plate (Col. 4-5, Lines 10-4), the computational device (i) receiving the quantity related to the stability factor for each trial (Col. 4-5, Lines 10-4), (ii) determining a rank order for the quantities, each quantity for each trial being associated with a rank (Col. 4-5, Lines 10-4, fig. 3, unit 318, 326, fig. 11, unit 1108-1140), and (iii) determining if any of the ranks associated with a given one of the trials has fallen outside a reference range associated with the given trial performed under error-free conditions (Col. 3, Lines 3-33, Col. 4-5, Lines 10-4).

Regarding claim 4, Kadlec further discloses a display to display performance data (Col. 9, Lines 3-21, fig. 18b, fig. 25-27).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 4/18/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A, In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the force plate measurement variables of force related to an individual) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not

read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The claim does recite 'a force-plate for measuring a quantity related to a stability factor of a balance task performed in trials by a subject'. Kadlec discloses 'a force-plate for measuring a quantity related to a stability factor of a balance task performed in trials by a subject' in Col. 4, Lines 10-40.

The examiner reminds to the applicants that during patent examination, the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969). While the meaning of claims of issued patents are interpreted in light of the specification, prosecution history, prior art and other claims, this is not the mode of claim interpretation to be applied during examination. During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allowed. This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless applicant has provided a clear definition in the specification. *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Conclusion


THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tung S Lau whose telephone number is 571-272-2274. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Barlow can be reached on 571-272-2269. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306

Art Unit: 2863

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). TL


JoAnn Barlow
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2600